

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

M.J.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 4:12-CV-341 JAR
)	
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY)	
IN ST. LOUIS PHYSICIANS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Now before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Redact Portions of the Transcript of May 11, 2012 Hearing or, in the Alternative, Motion to Seal the Transcript. (ECF 105.)

On May 6, 2013, a notice of appeal was filed by Plaintiff. (ECF 95.) Generally, the filing of a timely notice of appeal has the effect of immediately transferring jurisdiction to the court of appeals. See A.L.A. ex rel. Liberty v. Avilla R-XIII Sch. Dist., No. 10-05054-CV-SW-SWH, 2012 WL 1112141, at * 1 n.1 (W.D. Mo. Mar. 31, 2012). Nevertheless, the district court retains jurisdiction over collateral matters not involved in the appeal. Id. Plaintiff's motion to seal involves a collateral matter regarding a transcript filed before this Court and, therefore, his motion may be determined by this Court even while the appeal is pending.


The Court finds good cause to allow Plaintiff an opportunity to file a transcript in which lines 10-11 on page 2 of ECF 104 have been redacted. However, the Court finds no reason to redact pages 12-13 of ECF 104. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Redact Portions of the Transcript of May 11, 2012 Hearing or, in the Alternative, Motion to Seal the Transcript (ECF 105) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part as follows.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall place ECF 104 under seal.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before **October 4, 2013**, Plaintiff shall file a copy of ECF 104 with only lines 10-11 of page 2 redacted. Such filing will not be placed under seal. Failure to timely file a redacted version of ECF 104 will result in the unsealing of ECF 104.

Dated this 30th day of September, 2013.



JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE